

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

At the outset, the courtesies extended by the Examiner and his supervisor in granting the 19 April 2006 interview are appreciatively noted. At the Interview, a general discussion took place regarding the clarifying amendments proposed to the Claims by the undersigned Attorney. During the Interview, the Examiner and his Supervisor suggested the addition of features shown in the figures but not recited in the Claims:

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Shieh reference in view of the Wu reference and further in view of the Cheng reference. In setting forth this rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Shieh fails to disclose the structure of the normal and controlling bulbs recited in Claim 1, but cited Wu and Cheng for disclosing them, concluding that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such features into the arrangement of Shieh in order to have a structure for a controlling bulb that is easily identifiable from the normal bulb.

As newly-amended Claim 1 now more clearly recites, Applicant's claimed system includes among its combination of features a second holder being "different in groove arrangement from said first holder." As Claim 1 also now more clearly recites, the first holder receiving the controlling bulb is "identifiable" from the second holder that receives the normal bulb.

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claim is nowhere disclosed by the cited references. As the Examiner readily acknowledged, the primarily-cited Shieh reference nowhere discloses the structure of a normal bulb and controlling bulb, disclosing merely means for fitting a specific bulb in a specific socket. While Wu's light bulb holder does disclose a first and second pair of projections extending inward from an inner surface of the first socket, such serves merely to guide the bulb connector into the holder. Furthermore, Wu does not contemplate a second holder, which receives a normal bulb, that has a different groove arrangement from the first holder.

The Wu reference discloses a connector 2 that is provided with two grooves 21 at two sides, each of which relates to one of the inner areas separated by an inclined plate 13. The pair of guides 14 engage an end of the light bulb connector 2. Therefore, the guides 14 (or projections) are not received within the two grooves 21 of the connector 2. Furthermore, as described above, the Wu reference fails to disclose a second holder having a different groove arrangement from the first holder.

Given the deficient teachings of the Shieh and Wu references, the secondarily-cited Cheng reference is found to be quite ineffectual to the present patentability analysis. The Cheng reference was cited for disclosing isolated features, and fails to sufficiently remedy the deficiencies of the Shieh and Wu references.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the Shieh, Wu, and Cheng references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending Claim for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rajiv S. Shah', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Rajiv S. Shah
Registration #56,247

Dated: 4/21/2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586